done so several times.(*Interruptions*). He is quite competent to do that. But I am sorry I don't have that much of quality, so I don't bring out a wrong statement.

So far as the imported components and indigenous competents are concerned, I have already stated product-mixwise and so far as it is in terms of rupee and in terms of dollar is concerned, if the hon. Member really insists, I can send it to him or lay on the table I have just now got. I think I don't have to waste much of time; if he wants, I shall send it to him.(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, the question is, what is the amount of foreign exchange used on producing one car. If you don't have that figure, you can send it later on, we don't expect it now.

SHRI P.K. THUNGON: That is why I was saying....

MR. SPEAKER: You can send it later on.

SHRI P.K. THUNGON: I don't have, at the moment, the splitting of the rupee part and dollar part. I can send it to him later.(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You admit that you have no information with you.

[*English*]

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Sir, the Minister has stated that he has misled the House in the Question Hour also.(*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Question No. 599.

[*Translation*]

Diversion of Funds Allocated for Irrigation Projects

*599. SHRI MAHENDRA KUMAR SINGH THAKUR:
DR. LAL BHADUR RAWAL:

Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have sought the approval of the Union Government for diverting the funds allocated for the irrigation projects to other projects;

(b) if so, the reaction thereto;

(c) the time by which approval is likely to be accorded;

(d) the amount allocated to these States for irrigation projects; and

(e) the actual amount utilised so far by these States?

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) to (e). A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

(a) to (e). The Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh had sought the approval of the Planning Commission for revising their respective Annual Plan outlays, including outlays on irrigation projects, for 1991-92. The proposals in this regard by the three State Governments were considered and the Revised Outlays were approved before the end of financial year 1991-92. The originally approved outlays for the Irrigation and Flood Control sector in the three States, the revisions proposed by the State Governments and the Revised Outlays are as below:

(Rs. lakhs)

		1991-92		
		Approved Outlay	Change proposed by State	Revised approved outlay
I.	ANDHRA PRADESH			
	(*Irrigation and Flood Control*)			
1.	Major and Medium Irrigation	23645	28905	28905
2.	Minor Irrigation	3904	4304	4304
3.	Command Area Development	547	433	433
4.	Flood Control	390	800	800
	TOTAL	28486	34442	34442
II.	UTTAR PRADESH			
	(*Irrigation and Flood Control*)			
1.	Major and Medium Irrigation	30508	21508	21508

(Rs. lakhs)

		1991-92		
		Approved Outlay	Change proposed by State	Revised approved outlay
2.	Minor Irrigation	8763	5926	5926
3.	Command Area Development	1800	1400	1400
4.	Flood Control	1500	1000	1000
	TOTAL	42571	29834	29834

III. MADHYA PRADESH

(*Irrigation and Flood Control*)

1.	Mahor and Medium Irrigation	38006	26543	26543
2.	Minor Irrigation	16977	12623	12623

(Rs. lakhs)

		1991-92		
		Approved Outlay	Change proposed by State	Revised approved outlay
3.	Command Area Development	2491	1881	1881
4.	Flood Control	98	77	77
	TOTAL	57572	41124	41124

The actual expenditures against the revised approved outlays have not been reported by the State Governments.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MAHENDRA KUMAR SINGH THAKUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether funds allocated to Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have been made keeping in view the ratio of population of the State and land under irrigation. What are the norms?

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh had sent revised outlay proposals to the Planning Commission for 1991-92 and I have given these details in part (a) to (e) of my reply. The hon. Member should go through it and as far as norms are concerned I would like to inform the hon. Member that a formula has been evolved for plan allocation, and it was applied last year also.

SHRI MAHENDRA KUMAR SINGH THAKUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know much amount out of the allocated funds has been spent in Madhya Pradesh and what is the balance? Similarly how much expenditure has been incurred in the first phase of Upper Tapti project and how much will be incurred in the second phase?

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Mr. Speaker Sir, I have given full details about Madhya Pradesh in the part III of my reply. Details have been given under two separate heads of irrigation. One is Major and Medium irrigation and the other is Minor irrigation. It has also been given in that——

[*English*]

The Actual expenditure against the revised approved Plan Outlay have not been reported by the State Governments. The State Governments have yet to report to us the actual expenditure in connection with these projects.

SHRI MAHENDRA KUMAR SINGH THAKUR: What are the details regarding Upper Thapti project?

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Sir, as I have submitted, they have not yet submitted the details of the expenditure incurred. I can send it to the hon. Member after I receive the details.

[*Translation*]

DR. LAL BHADUR RAWAL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, according to the reply of the hon. Minister the outlay for Andhra Pradesh has been increased and the outlay for Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh has been reduced while the respective State Governments had sought its revision. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh Government had sought permission to divert the allocated outlay for irrigation projects to some other projects and if so, the details thereof. Besides, had the Union Government given permission to divert the outlay of those projects and if not the reasons therefor?—(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I have submitted earlier there is no question of diversion. The State Governments have given revised outlay. Some of the reasons were some and it has been decided by the State Governments and not by the Centre. No discrimination has been done....(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ D. CHAVAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the outlay for irrigation in relation to the State of Andhra Pradesh has been increased, while the outlay for irrigation sought by Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh Governments has been reduced. So, I would like to ask the Minister whether this is in keeping with the philosophy of development followed by these Governments, namely the Madhya Pradesh Governments and the Uttar Pradesh Government, which seek to de-emphasize irrigation.

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: Sir, there is no question of making any discrimination regarding these two States. These are the Plan Outlays which are approved in consultation with the State Governments and revision is made only at their request. We do not make

any revision due to financial constraints.

[*Translation*]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the major, medium and minor irrigation projects and flood control projects of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh are the main problems of these States. Only 30-32 percent land in these States is under irrigation and these States are hit by unprecedented floods also. Keeping in view these things the Planning Commission had sanctioned funds earlier, but now it has been reduced by one third for flood control as well as for irrigation projects in both the States i.e. Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. The State Governments, must have been in deep trouble because inspite of paucity of funds, they have revised the plan outlay in essential areas. The Planning Commission had them funds on the basis that these are the core sectors. Keeping in view these things, will attention be paid on enhancing their resources so that there is no paucity funds in those core-sectors.

[*English*]

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: May I submit that this is correct that there is a shortfall to the extent of 28.56 per cent. But the general shortfall is 29.37 per cent. So, the irrigation has suffered less. Since there is general cut in the total Plan outlay for all the sectors, this sector has also been affected. But irrigation has suffered minimum.

[*Translation*]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had asked that funds had been reduced and that has been accepted by the hon. Minister. I had asked whether keeping in view the slow progress of these states the Planning Commission proposes to enhance the allocated funds?

[*English*]

SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ: As I submitted, the State proposal is there and that has been accepted. But no demand has been provided.(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

Cess in Lieu of Services

*600 SHRI BRAHMANAND MADAL: Will the Minister of COAL be pleased to state:

(a) whether the coal management has been providing tonnage cess in lieu of the services rendered by the Coal-mining Area Development Authority;

(b) if so, the extent thereof and from whom this cess is collected;

(c) whether the coal management proposes to discontinue this essential service and

(d) if not, the time by which it is proposed to start the payment of the outstanding amount of tonnage cess?

[*English*]

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COAL (SHRI S.B. NYAMAGOUDA) (a) to (d). A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

(a) and (b). Yes, Sir, Coal Companies had been pausing the cess at the rate of Rs. 3.50 per tonne of coal and Rs. 4.00 per tonne of hard coke and soft coke to Coal Mining Area Development Authority (CMDA) on despatches of coal/coke from the concerned coal fields. The cess was realised from the buyers of coal/coke.

(c) and (d). According to information furnished by the Coal Companies, payment of the cess has been stopped consequent to court decisions holding that State Governments are not empowered to levy any cesses on coal. Coal Companies are paying separately for the water being supplied by CMDA. Since CMADA has been established under the authority of Govt. of Bihar decision about its continuation has to